

NOV 1 A 1995

Name:

Student number:

Computational Science 260
Midterm Exam

Fill in answers in space provided. Use back of page for draft.

Nov. 2, 1995

 $\frac{R}{\bullet}$

Marks

1. Translate " $X = 4$ if $Y = 2$. Otherwise, $X = 3$ " into propositional calculus. Use P for $X = 4$, Q for $Y = 2$ and R for $X = 3$. $(P \Leftarrow Q) \wedge (R \Rightarrow \neg Q) \equiv$

Wrong: $(P \Leftarrow Q) \vee R$. Reason: Consider $Y \neq 2$, $X \neq 3$.

2. In the following derivation, state all laws used. In some cases, two laws are used simultaneously. In this case, state both laws. Also, the same law may have been applied twice. State this also.

| Expression | Law(s) used | see page 34, notes |
|---|---|--------------------|
| $\neg(P \wedge Q) \wedge (\neg P \vee R) \wedge R$ | | |
| $\equiv \neg(P \wedge Q) \vee \neg(\neg P \vee R) \vee \neg R$ | De Morgan | |
| $\equiv (\neg P \vee \neg Q) \vee (P \wedge \neg R) \vee \neg R$ | De Morgan ($2x$), double neg. | |
| $\equiv \neg P \vee \neg Q \vee (P \wedge \neg R) \vee \neg R$ | Associative | |
| $\equiv \neg P \vee \neg Q \vee (P \wedge \neg R) \vee (F \vee \neg R)$ | Identity, Commutative ($\neg R \equiv F \vee \neg R$) | |
| $\equiv \neg P \vee \neg Q \vee (P \wedge F) \vee \neg R$ | Distributive, Commutative | |
| $\equiv \neg P \vee \neg Q \vee \neg R$ | {Zero ($P \wedge F \equiv F$), identity, domination} | |

3. State on whether the following quote is true or false. If the quote is 3
false, correct it in an appropriate way.

The reason the parentheses can be omitted in $a + b + c$, but
not in $a - (b - c)$, is that $+$ is a distributive operator, but
 $-$ is not. associative

4. A universe of discourse consists of three individuals a_1, a_2 and a_3 . 12
In this universe, two predicates are defined, namely $P(x)$ and $Q(x)$.
In particular, $P(a_1)$ is true, whereas $P(a_2)$ and $P(a_3)$ are both false.
Moreover, $Q(a_1)$ is true, $Q(a_2)$ is false, and $Q(a_3)$ is true. Find the
truth value of the following expressions. To prevent guessing, points
will be deducted for wrong answers.

(a) $\forall x(P(x) \Rightarrow Q(x))$ T

(b) $\exists x(\neg P(x) \wedge Q(x))$ T

(c) $\forall x(Q(x) \Rightarrow P(x))$ F

(d) $\forall x(P(x) \vee Q(x))$ F

| x | $P(x)$ | $Q(x)$ | $\neg P(x) \Rightarrow Q(x)$ | $\neg P(x) \wedge Q(x)$ | $Q(x) \Rightarrow P(x)$ | $P(x) \vee Q(x)$ |
|-------|--------|--------|------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| a_1 | T | T | T | F | T | T |
| a_2 | F | F | T | F | T | F |
| a_3 | F | T | T | T | F | T |

5. Give a formal derivation for $\exists x R(x)$, given the premises are $\forall x(P(x) \Rightarrow R(x))$ and $\exists x(\neg P(x) \Rightarrow R(x))$. State the laws of inference you used, and the lines involved in your derivations. State all rules of inference used, but restrict yourself to the standard rules used in class. 15

| | | |
|----|--|--------------------|
| 1. | $\forall x (P(x) \Rightarrow R(x))$ | premise |
| 2. | $\exists x (\neg P(x) \Rightarrow R(x))$ | premise |
| 3. | $\neg P(a) \Rightarrow R(a)$ | 2, EI |
| 4. | $P(a) \Rightarrow R(a)$ | 1, UI ($x := a$) |
| 5. | $R(a)$ | 3, 4, cases |
| 6. | $\exists x R(x)$ | 5, EG. |

Note: The following leads to a dead end.

| | | |
|----|--|---------|
| 1. | $\forall x (P(x) \Rightarrow R(x))$ | premise |
| 2. | $P(a) \Rightarrow R(a)$ | 1, UI |
| 3. | $\exists x (\neg P(x) \Rightarrow R(x))$ | premise |

Now, a is used, and $\exists x(\neg P(x) \Rightarrow R(x))$ cannot be instantiated to $\neg P(a) \Rightarrow R(a)$

Moral: Always do existential instantiation first.

Note: do not use a for existential instantiation!³

b. Proof by Recursion:

1. Well founded: Each call to this is done with a smaller list than the previous call. This will eventually result in an empty list,
and there is no recursion for the empty list.
2. 2 base cases must be considered:

(a) $N=1$, and List not empty:

• this (N , List, X) make X the first element of List, by clause 1.

(b) List empty;

• this (N , List, X) fails.

3. Inductive step: If N is the N^{th} element in List, then $N-1$ is the $(N-1)^{th}$ element in the tail of List.

- 6. A database stores facts of the form `wasat(Name, Function)` to indicate that individual Name attended Function. Two people meet if they attend the same function. Write a predicate `meets(X,Y)` which succeeds if X meets Y after attending the same function.

`meets(X,Y) :- wasat(X,Z), wasat(Y,Z),
X \= Y.`

7. Consider the predicate `this` defined as follows

20

`this(1, [X | _], X).`

`this(N-1, [_ | Tail], Y) :- N is N-1, this(M, Tail, Y).`

a) Trace `this(2, [jim, mary, john], X)`.

b) What does the predicate `this` do? Give a proof by recursion that this is correct.

c) Are you allowed to replace the above definition by

`this(1, [X | _], X).`

`this(N, [N, [_ | Tail]], Y) :- this(N-1, Tail, Y).`

State why or why not. Not possible, because $N-1$ is a structure. It is not evaluated.

a) ① `this(2, [- | [mary, john]], X) :-`

don't care
since $M=1$, M is 2-1, $this(1, [mary, john], X)$,

~~`this(2, [- | [mary, john]], X) :- this(1, [-, ...], X)`~~

② `this(1, [mary, john], X)` unifies with

~~`this(1, [X | _], X)`, and $X = mary$,~~

b) `this(N, List, X)` succeeds if X is the N^{th} element of $List$, and it fails otherwise,

③ `this(2, [- | [m, j]], X) :- (M=1), this(1, [- | [m, j]], X).`

④ `this(1, [mary | _], mary).`

8. Prove $(m = 3), (m * y = z) \vdash (y = 2) \Rightarrow (z = 6)$. Indicate the rules 12 you used. In addition to the normal rules of logic, you are allowed to use the normal rules of arithmetic for doing your multiplications. Give all the lines of your derivation, together with the laws used.

1. $m = 3$ Premise
2. $m * y = 3$ Premise
3. $3 * y = 3$ 1, 2, substitution
4. $y = 2$ assumption
5. $3 * 2 = 3$ 3, 4, substitution
6. $6 = 3$ calculation.
7. $3 = 3$ reflexivity
8. $(y = 2) \Rightarrow (3 = 6)$ 4-6, deduction theorem.

9. What is the difference between "Not everyone works" and "everyone does not work". Express statements in predicate calculus, and give an interpretation in which the two statements have different truth values.

$W(x)$: x works.

Not everyone works : $\neg \forall x W(x)$ negation: all.

Everyone does not work : $\forall x \neg W(x)$ negation: $\neg W$

Interpretation: Give 2 individuals a, b , with
 $W(a) = T$ and $W(b) = F$. Then $\neg \forall x W(x) \Leftrightarrow T$, but $\forall x \neg W(x) \Leftrightarrow F$.

10. If P and R are true, yet Q is false, what can you say about the truth value of the following expression.

$$\begin{array}{c} \overline{(P \wedge Q \Rightarrow R) \vee Q} \\ (F \Rightarrow T) \vee F \\ T \end{array}$$

Trivially true.

100

The End